

REMARKS

Applicants amend claims 8, 12, 14, 18, 20, and 22. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-14, and 17-22 are pending.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the examiner for the interview of February 12, 2009, with Applicants' attorneys Peter J. Gordon and Oliver B. Strimpel. Claim 1 was discussed with reference to U.S. Patent No. 6,246,961 to Sasaki et al. (Sasaki). It was agreed that Sasaki does not disclose "processing at least one of the two input images to generate an output image that includes a motion-based effect, wherein the processing uses the computed estimate of motion of the desired characteristic," as required by claim 1. We discuss this point below.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sasaki. But contrary to what the examiner asserted, Sasaki fails to disclose "processing at least one of the two input images to generate an output image that includes a motion-based effect, wherein the processing uses the computed estimate of motion of the desired characteristic," as required by the claim.

In the Office action, the examiner argued that Figure 6 of Sasaki is an output image that includes a motion effect. But that is not correct because Figure 6 is instead a graphical illustration that indicates how Sasaki performs his motion computation. Sasaki refers to Figure 6 as "a view showing how optical flow is detected from the noticeable edges in the two images taken at different times..." (Sasaki, 3:65-67). Nowhere in Sasaki were we able to find any mention of an output image that includes a motion effect, as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 1 requires that processing of at least one of the two input images to generate an output image "uses the computed estimate of motion of the desired characteristic." Because Sasaki's Figure 6 illustrates how motion is computed, it cannot be the result of processing that uses the computed motion.

The examiner also rejected independent claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sasaki. Claim 8 contains a limitation analogous to the one discussed above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, Applicants believe that claims 1 and 8, and dependent claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-14, and 17-22 are not anticipated by Sasaki.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

No fees are believed due with this Reply; however, please charge any fees that may be due, or credit any overpayments, to **Deposit Account No. 50-0876**.

Filed EFS-Web
on February 13, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Oliver Strimpel/

Oliver Strimpel
Attorney for Applicants
Avid Technology, Inc.
One Park West
Tewksbury, MA 01876
Tel.: (978) 640-6789